

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

In the Matter of the Investigation Into	)	Docket No. UT-003022
U S WEST Communications, Inc.'s	)	
Compliance with Section 271 of the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	
..... In)		
the Matter of U S WEST Communications,	)	Docket No. UT-003040
Inc.'s Statement of Generally Available	)	
Terms Pursuant to Section 252(f) of the	)	<b>U S WEST'S LEGAL BRIEF</b>
Telecommunications Act of 1996.	)	<b>REGARDING EXCLUSION OF</b>
		<b>INTERNET-BOUND TRAFFIC</b>

---

**INTRODUCTION**

U S WEST Communications, Inc. ("U S WEST") submits this brief to the Washington Utilities Transportation Commission ("WUTC") regarding the exclusion of Internet-bound traffic from U S WEST's Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions ("SGAT") and from consideration of U S WEST's compliance with checklist item 13, 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii), in Washington.

U S WEST is keenly aware of the prior Commission's rulings on treatment of Internet-bound traffic in past proceedings. Although U S WEST does not agree with those rulings, it has paid reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic under its interconnection agreements with competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs") in Washington pursuant to the Commission's decisions. Indeed, as described in the workshop, U S WEST has paid approximately \$14 million to Washington CLECs, which includes Internet-bound traffic, and received far less than \$1 million in return.

U S WEST urges the Commission to recognize the entirely different context in which the issue arises in these proceedings. As set forth fully below, for a host of reasons, the Commission should accept U S WEST's exclusion of Internet-bound traffic from the SGAT and from these proceedings.

First, the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") has conclusively determined that compensation for Internet-bound traffic is an "inter-carrier compensation" issue, *not* a "reciprocal compensation" issue, and *not* a checklist item 13 issue. This FCC determination in the 271 context remains binding in this proceeding and on this Commission's consideration of U S WEST's compliance with checklist item 13.

Accordingly, compensation for Internet-bound traffic is irrelevant to determining U S WEST's compliance with this checklist item.

Second, it is unnecessary for the Commission to address this issue in reviewing U S WEST's SGAT. Under 47 U.S.C. § 252(f)(1)&(2), U S WEST's SGAT must comply with Section 251. No provision of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("the Act") and no FCC order *requires* U S WEST to pay CLECs reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic as a matter of Section 251. Thus, U S WEST is free to exclude such traffic from its SGAT.

Third, no CLEC is required to accept the SGAT's terms, and no CLEC will be bound by the Commission's determinations in this proceeding. The SGAT is U S WEST's standard offering. As the Act makes clear, U S WEST's submission of an SGAT in no way precludes a CLEC from negotiating its own interconnection agreement with U S WEST or seeking arbitration of this issue before the Commission. Therefore, those CLECs who believe reciprocal compensation should be paid for this traffic are free to decline this arrangement in the SGAT and negotiate or arbitrate this issue with U S WEST. Accordingly, whether the SGAT includes or excludes reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic is simply not relevant.

Finally, these workshop proceedings are not the proper forum to address this issue. The Commission is asked only to determine whether U S WEST complies with the checklist requirements of Section 271, not to develop its overall policy or legal determination on this issue. The Commission has and will continue to develop its policy on this issue in its ongoing cost docket or in Section 252 proceedings, where it is more appropriately raised. Furthermore, no CLEC submitted factual testimony or evidence in support of their positions on compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Thus, this Commission cannot develop an informed opinion on this issue in the context of these proceedings.

Accordingly, U S WEST requests that the Commission accept U S WEST's exclusion of Internet-bound traffic from its SGAT and strike consideration of this "inter-carrier compensation" issue from consideration of U S WEST's compliance with checklist item 13.

## ARGUMENT

### A. Compensation for Internet-Bound Traffic Is Not A Section 271 Issue.

In its Bell Atlantic New York Order,<sup>1</sup> the FCC dispositively held that inter-carrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic is not a "reciprocal compensation" issue under 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(5) and "is *not* a checklist item."<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the FCC determined that because Internet-bound traffic is not "local" traffic, it is outside the bounds of 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(5). Paragraph 377 of the Bell Atlantic New York Order states:

---

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum Opinion and Order, Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York, CC Docket No. 99-295, FCC 99-404 (Dec. 22, 1999).

<sup>2</sup> Id. ¶ 377 (emphasis added).

We recognize that Bell Atlantic has an obligation to comply with New York Commission orders concerning inter-carrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic . . . . Inter-carrier compensation for ISP bound traffic, however, is not governed by section 251(b)(5), and, therefore, is not a checklist item.

Because Internet-bound traffic is not governed by Section 251(b)(5), it is irrelevant to consideration of whether U S WEST satisfies the requirements of checklist item 13.<sup>3</sup> The FCC reached a similar conclusion in the Second BellSouth Louisiana Order, in which it declined to consider compensation for Internet-bound traffic in determining whether BellSouth satisfied the requirements of checklist item 13.<sup>4</sup>

It is immaterial to this proceeding that the D.C. Circuit in Bell Atlantic Tel. Cos. v. FCC<sup>5</sup> vacated the FCC's declaratory ruling on Internet-bound traffic.<sup>6</sup> The D.C. Circuit did not address or review the Bell Atlantic New York Order in its decision, and, therefore, the Bell Atlantic New York Order remains valid. Moreover, the D.C. Circuit did *not* hold that the FCC erred in determining that Internet-bound traffic is interstate or that it does not terminate within a local calling area. Rather, the court simply remanded the matter to the FCC for further analysis and clarification. Indeed, in the wake of this ruling, the FCC has specifically declared its intent to *reaffirm* its prior determination that Internet-bound traffic is interstate, and therefore, excluded from reciprocal compensation arrangements under Section 251(b)(5). *See* Telecommunications Reports Daily, *Strickling Believes FCC Can Justify Recip Comp Ruling in Face of Remand* (Mar. 24, 2000); Kathy Chen, *Court Orders FCC to Reconsider Ruling that Internet Calls are Long Distance*, WALL STREET JOURNAL, March 27, 2000 at B8.

Although the issue of treatment of Internet-bound traffic may be relevant in other Commission dockets, the Bell Atlantic New York Order conclusively establishes that the intervenors arguments regarding compensation for Internet-bound traffic do not belong in this proceeding. Moreover, to the extent the Commission believes that U S WEST has a "legally binding" obligation to pay reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic, U S WEST has met it. U S WEST has and continues to pay CLECs for this traffic under its current interconnection agreements.

## **B. Compensation for Internet-Bound Traffic Is Not An SGAT Issue.**

Compensation for Internet-bound traffic also is not an SGAT issue. Under Section 252(f)(1), U S WEST's SGAT must comply with Section 251. No provision of the Act and no FCC order requires U S WEST to include Internet-bound traffic in the reciprocal compensation provisions of its SGAT under that section. Accordingly, U S WEST properly excluded such traffic from the reciprocal compensation provisions.

The CLECs appear to argue that since the D.C. Circuit vacated the FCC's ISP Declaratory

---

<sup>3</sup> Id.

<sup>4</sup> Memorandum Opinion and Order, Application of BellSouth Corporation et al for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana, 13 FCC Rcd 20599 ¶ 303 (1998) ("Second BellSouth Louisiana Order").

<sup>5</sup> 206 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

<sup>6</sup> Declaratory Ruling and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Inter-Carrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic, 14 FCC Rcd 3689 (Feb. 26, 1999) (the "ISP Declaratory Ruling").

Ruling, U S WEST is *required* to include Internet-bound traffic in its SGAT. As set forth above, however, the court did not vacate that order on the merits; rather, it remanded it to the FCC to further explain its analysis. Thus, nothing in the D.C. Circuit's decision mandates that U S WEST pay reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Likewise, the Fifth Circuit's decision in Southwestern Bell Tel. Co. v. Public Utils. Comm'n<sup>7</sup> is inapplicable: that court simply held that the Texas commission did not err in *interpreting* an *existing* interconnection agreement to require reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic based upon evidence from the past. The court did not, nor could it, hold that all incumbent LECs *must* include such traffic in reciprocal compensation arrangements on a going-forward basis.

The intervenors' attempts to inject this issue into this proceeding suggest two mistaken beliefs: (1) that the SGAT will somehow violate the law because the FCC will revise its determination on Internet-bound traffic or its prior determination will not withstand judicial scrutiny, and (2) the SGAT must include reciprocal compensation for this traffic because the intervenors believe reciprocal compensation should be paid for it. Neither of these concerns should persuade the Commission to require U S WEST to include reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic in its SGAT.

Section 2.2 of the SGAT in conjunction with Section 7 eliminates the intervenors' first concern. Section 2.2 states in part:

To the extent that the Existing Rules are changed, vacated, dismissed, stayed, or modified, then this Agreement and all contracts adopting all or part of this Agreement shall be amended to reflect such modification or change of the Existing Rules.

If the FCC were to backtrack on its public statements that it intends to reaffirm its prior determination that Internet-bound traffic is interstate and excluded from Section 251(b)(5) arrangements, or if its determination is overturned on the merits, Section 2.2 will incorporate any valid and binding change in the law. Thus, if there is some subsequent binding federal order that requires U S WEST to include Internet-bound traffic in the reciprocal compensation provisions of the SGAT, the SGAT will be amended to comply with the law.

To the extent any intervenor opposes the exclusion of Internet-bound traffic from the reciprocal compensation provisions of the SGAT for competitive or others reasons, their remedy is simple: do not accept the reciprocal compensation arrangements in the SGAT. Under Section 1.8 of the SGAT, CLECs are free to accept some arrangements from the SGAT, while declining to accept the reciprocal compensation arrangement. Furthermore, unlike an arbitrated interconnection agreement in which the parties are bound by the Commission's determinations, no carrier is bound to execute the SGAT or the provisions contained in it. The Act is unmistakably clear that U S WEST's submission of an SGAT, or this Commission's approval of it, does not relieve U S WEST of its duty to negotiate individual interconnection agreements with any CLEC that wishes to do so.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, the SGAT itself reiterates U S WEST's commitment to negotiate and arbitrate interconnection agreements with CLECs who choose to forego its terms.<sup>9</sup> Thus, it is immaterial to review of the SGAT that some carriers may oppose or disapprove its terms. Any carrier remains free to negotiate or arbitrate this issue before the Commission,

---

<sup>7</sup> 208 F.3d 475 (5th Cir. 2000).

<sup>8</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 252(f)(5).

<sup>9</sup> SGAT § 1.5.

regardless of the submission or approval of the SGAT.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, it is simply inappropriate to force U S WEST to include reciprocal compensation for Internet-bound traffic in an SGAT. The SGAT is U S WEST's *standard* contract offering. Because no carrier is bound to accept its terms and they have the added option of negotiating or arbitrating their own agreements, there is no basis to require U S WEST – in the context of a standard contract offering – to include a provision that is not required by federal law. Although some of the CLECs claim that this exclusion is so offensive no carrier would ever accept it or desire its terms, McLeod, a sophisticated competitor, has executed the Washington SGAT, including the reciprocal compensation provisions, without exception. Thus, the exclusion of Internet-bound traffic is perfectly acceptable to CLECs who do not focus their business on serving only Internet service providers.

Exclusion of Internet-bound traffic does not eliminate the many benefits the SGAT offers to CLECs. As set forth above, CLECs are free to accept any arrangement in the SGAT while declining the reciprocal compensation provisions. U S WEST should not be required in this standard offering to include provisions that the law does not require.

**C. This Is Not The Proper Forum To Address Compensation for Internet-Bound Traffic.**

As set forth above, inter-carrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic is not a relevant consideration in reviewing U S WEST's compliance with checklist item 13 or the lawfulness of its SGAT. Moreover, the Commission is not charged in this docket with establishing its public policy position or legal determination on treatment of Internet-bound traffic. Indeed, the intervenors have submitted no factual testimony and no documentary support for their claims on this issue: their testimony recites primarily legal arguments, not facts. Thus, the intervenors, who themselves seek to inject this issue into this proceeding, have not provided the Commission with any information that would permit this Commission to make an informed decision. Instead, the issue of compensation for Internet-bound traffic should be addressed in the context of the next phase of the Commission's ongoing cost docket. Consideration in the cost docket will permit the Commission address in detail the evidence all parties wish to present on this issue, allow the Commission's experts to consider more up-to-date evidence on the topic, and permit the Commission to establish a well-informed, and more current, public policy determination on this issue.

**CONCLUSION**

This docket is intended to address a limited issue: whether U S WEST's application to provide in-region interLATA service complies with Section 271 of the Act. The FCC has determined that treatment of Internet-bound traffic is an "inter-carrier compensation" issue, but not a checklist item 13 concern. Although intervenors may not agree with this determination, it remains controlling in this proceeding. Furthermore, no requirement of federal law requires U S WEST to include Internet-bound traffic in the reciprocal compensation provisions of its SGAT. Thus, the intervenors' comments and arguments on treatment of Internet-bound traffic are inappropriate in this docket.

The Commission should permit U S WEST to exclude Internet-bound traffic from its

---

<sup>10</sup> Indeed, U S WEST is currently arbitrating this issue with Sprint and will be bound by the Commission's determination in that interconnection proceeding.

standard contract offering and exclude consideration of its issue from its deliberations on U S WEST's compliance with checklist item 13. To the extent any carrier believes it should receive compensation for Internet-bound traffic, the proper forum for that dispute is the Commission's cost docket or a Section 252 arbitration.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of July, 2000

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Anderl  
U S WEST Law Department  
1600 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Suite 3206  
Seattle, WA 98191  
(206) 345-1574

---

Steven R. Beck  
U S WEST Law Department  
1801 California Street  
Suite 5100  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 672-2736

Kara M. Sacilotto  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
607 Fourteenth Street, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005-2011  
(202) 628-6600

ATTORNEYS FOR U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS,  
INC.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
**Docket Nos. UT-003022 and UT-003040**

I hereby certify that I have this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July 2000, caused the foregoing **U S West's Legal Brief Regarding Exclusion of Internet-Bound Traffic** to be served upon all parties of record in this proceeding, via first class mail.

McLEOD USA TELLECOMMUNICATIONS  
SVCS.

6400 C Street SW  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406

Kalene Anderson  
NEXTLINK WASHINGTON, INC. (T582)

1000 Denny Way, Suite 200  
Seattle, WA 98109

Nigel Bates

Director

ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE  
REGULATORY & INDUSTRY AFFAIRS

4400 NE 77th Avenue  
Vancouver, WA 98662

Penny Bewick  
NEW EDGE NETWORK DBA NEW EDGE  
NETWORKS

3000 Columbia House Blvd., Suite 106  
Vancouver, WA 98661

Greg Bogus

METRONET SERVICES  
800 Stewart St., Suite 300

Seattle, WA 98101

Francis Coleman

MGC COMMUNICATIONS DBA MPOWER  
171 Sully's Trail, Suite 202

Pittsford, NY 14534

Clay Deanhardt

COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY

4250 Burton Drive

Santa Clara, CA 95054



Andrew Isar  
Director-State Affairs  
ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNICATIONS  
ENTERPRISE  
3220 Uddenberg Lane, Suite 4  
Gig Harbor, WA 98335  
Nancy Judy  
AVP EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
UNITED TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE  
NORTHWEST  
902 Wasco Street  
M.S. A0412  
Hood River, OR 97031  
Rich Lipman  
McLEOD USA  
6400 C Street SW  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406  
Christine Mailloux  
Associate General Counsel  
NORTHPOINT COMMUNICATIONS  
303 Second Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Donna Mozina  
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.  
Government and External Affairs  
161 Inverness Drive West  
Englewood, CO 80112  
Kathryn L. Thomas  
VP REGULATORY & PUBLIC POLICY  
ADVANCED TELECOM GROUP, INC.  
100 Stony Point Road, Suite 130  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401  
Rhonda Weaver  
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS  
1501 S. Capitol Way, Suite 204  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Sue Williams  
JATO COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION  
1099 18th St., Suite 2200  
Denver, CO 80202

Dennis Ahlers  
Senior Attorney  
ESCHELON TELECOM, INC.  
730 Second Avenue S., Suite 1200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Arthur Butler  
ATER, WYNNE, LLP  
601 Union Street, Suite 5450  
Seattle, WA 98101-2327

R. Dale Dixon, Jr.  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
1300 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 2300  
Portland, OR 97201

Brooks Harlow  
MILLER, NASH, WIENER, HAGER &  
CARLSON  
4400 Two Union Square  
601 Union Street  
Seattle, Wa 98101-2352

Eric S. Heath  
Attorney  
SPRINT  
MS: NVLSVB0207  
330 S. Valley View Blvd.  
Las Vegas, NV 89107

Ann Hopfenbeck  
Attorney  
MCI WORLDCOM  
707 17th Street, Suite 3600  
Denver, CO 80202

Gregory J. Kopta  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE  
2600 Century Square  
1501 Fourth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101-1688

Mary B. Tribby  
AT&T LAW DEPARTMENT  
1875 Lawrence St., Suite 1500  
Denver, CO 80202

Mark P. Trinchero  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE  
1300 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 2300  
Portland, OR 97201-5682

Shannon Smith  
Assistant Attorney General  
WUTC  
Attorney General Office  
State Mail Stop 40128  
Greg J. Trautman  
Assistant Attorney General  
WUTC  
State Mail Stop 40128  
Simon Ffitch  
AAG  
Office of the Attorney General  
Public Counsel  
900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98164

---

Pamela Iverson